

March 25, 2022

1

3 SHERROD, TEED, VANDERHAGEN and WARE,

4 Plaintiffs,

- V -

Case No. 17-10164

VNA and LAN

Defendants.

1

## HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDITH E. LEVY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

MARCH 25, 2022

APPEARANCES:

Corey M. Stern  
Levy Konigsberg, LLP  
605 Third Avenue, 33rd Floor  
New York, New York 10158

Moshe Maimon  
Levy Konigsberg, LLP  
605 Third Avenue, 33rd Floor  
New York, New York 10158

Melanie Daly  
Levy Konigsberg, LLP  
605 Third Avenue, 33rd Floor  
New York, New York 10158

(Appearances Continued on Next Page)

24 TO OBTAIN A  
CERTIFIED  
TRANSCRIPT:

JESECA C. EDDINGTON, RDR, RMR, CRR, FCRR  
FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
200 EAST LIBERTY STREET  
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48104

March 25, 2022

2

1 Daniel Stein  
2 Mayer Brown LLP  
3 1221 Avenue of the Americas  
4 New York, New York 10020  
5  
6 Marcus Christian  
7 Mayer Brown LLP  
8 1999 K Street NW  
9 Washington, District of Columbia 20006  
10  
11 Mark R. Ter Molen  
12 Mayer Brown LLP  
13 71 South Wacker Drive  
14 Chicago, Illinois 60606  
15  
16 Wayne Brian Mason  
17 Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP  
18 1717 Main Street, Suite 5400  
19 Dallas, Texas 75201  
20  
21 David C. Kent  
22 Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP  
23 1717 Main Street, Suite 5400  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
24  
25 Jude T. Hickland  
26 Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP  
27 1717 Main Street, Suite 5400  
28 Dallas, Texas 75201  
29  
30 Philip A. Erickson  
31 Plunkett & Cooney  
32 325 East Grand River Avenue, Suite 250  
33 East Lansing, Michigan 48823  
34  
35 Alexander S. Rusek  
36 Whitelaw PLLC  
37 2549 Jolly Road, Suite 340  
38 Okemos, Michigan 48864  
39  
40 Juan A. Mateo, Jr.  
41 Law Offices of Juan Mateo  
42 300 River Place, Suite 3000  
43 Detroit, Michigan 48207  
44  
45 (Appearances Continued on Next Page)

*(Appearances Continued on Next Page)*

March 25, 2022

3

4 Sarissa Montague  
Levine & Levine Attorneys at Law  
136 East Michigan Ave 14th Floor  
5 Kalamazoo, Michigan 49007

6 Charlie Quigg  
7 Warner Norcross & Judd LLP  
2715 Woodward Avenue, Suite 300  
Detroit, Michigan 48201

9 Michael A. Rataj  
Michael A. Rataj, PC  
10 500 Griswold Street, Suite 2450  
Detroit, Michigan 48226

11 Brian Lennon  
12 Warner Norcross & Judd LLP  
2715 Woodward Avenue, Suite 300  
Detroit, Michigan 48201

March 25, 2022

4

1	<b><u>I N D E X</u></b>	
2		
3	<u>MISCELLANY</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
4	Proceedings.....	5
	Certificate.....	37
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

## PROCEEDINGS

2 THE CLERK: Calling Sherrod, Teed, Vanderhagen and  
3 Ware vs. VNA and LAN.

4 THE COURT: Thank you, Jeseca.

5 Please be seated.

6 Well, thank you all for being here a little bit  
7 early. We're trying to accommodate a number of competing  
8 needs today with the schedule.

9 So this is the date and time we set for a follow-up  
10 hearing on the sort of aftermath of my opinion and decision  
11 regarding the motion to quash filed by the five witnesses who  
12 are under criminal indictment.

13                   And when we last left it yesterday around noon, VNA  
14 and LAN provided to me and to the plaintiffs and I think a  
15 similar time to the various lawyers for each of the witnesses,  
16 the areas that they wished to examine set out in at least two  
17 categories and, in some instances, three.

18 Category 1 was areas of trial testimony that they  
19 sought from your clients that relates to what I have held is  
20 waiver testimony. Similar questions to the questions asked at  
21 the depositions in this case. And then areas that either  
22 expand or go beyond that.

23 And in at least one instance, it was broken out by  
24 the reason for this is there is new information, since those  
25 depositions were taken in the summer of 2020.

March 25, 2022

6

1           When we last spoke, it was yesterday afternoon. The  
2 plaintiffs, Mr. Maimon and Mr. Stern, had not yet had a chance  
3 to look at the proposals from VNA and LAN.

4           So I promised to give them an opportunity just to  
5 speak a little bit, if you want it now or you want to reserve  
6 that for later.

7           MR. MAIMON: We can reserve it for later, Your Honor.

8           THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Maimon, it's difficult to  
9 hear, has said they can reserve their argument for later.

10           So what I think makes sense to do is to work our way  
11 through this starting -- we have counsel for Governor Snyder.  
12 And what I have before me is your original motion to quash,  
13 but more importantly, Governor Snyder's indictment. And then  
14 I have the areas that VNA and LAN are seeking to question your  
15 client.

16           And so do you have any sort of opening remarks you'd  
17 like to make?

18           MR. QUIGG: Yes, Your Honor.

19           I'll start just by commenting on VNA and LAN's  
20 proposals. Frankly, Your Honor, we found them to be  
21 un-serious --

22           THE COURT: Excuse me. I'm sorry. I was logging in.

23           MR. QUIGG: No problem.

24           THE COURT: Please say that again.

25           MR. QUIGG: Frankly, Your Honor, we found VNA's and

March 25, 2022

7

1        LAN's proposals to be un-serious and not helpful in moving the  
2        ball forward.

3                    THE COURT: Okay.

4                    MR. QUIGG: And that's for a couple of reasons.

5                    As you noted, LAN did not identify really anything  
6        concrete additional that they wished to ask.

7                    THE COURT: Well, I don't know that I noted that,  
8        but --

9                    MR. QUIGG: And if you look at VNA's letter which has  
10       somewhat more detail, VNA -- the letter is so heavily caveated  
11       that it's almost useless. First, they say these are examples  
12       of areas --

13                  THE COURT: There are lawyers involved, after all.  
14       So what do you expect? But go ahead.

15                  MR. QUIGG: Fair enough, Your Honor. But I think  
16       it's an important point. Because if we're just dealing with  
17       examples and they're reserving their rights to ask any  
18       question whatsoever in the future, I don't know how we're  
19       resolving anything today.

20                  THE COURT: Well, fair enough. A little bit fair.

21                  But let's just start and break this down for a  
22       minute.

23                  In terms of the examples of areas covered during the  
24       witness's deposition that VNA intends to cover at trial, have  
25       you had a chance to look at Areas A through N?

March 25, 2022

8

1 MR. QUIGG: We have, Your Honor.

2                   THE COURT: Okay. And with respect to those areas,  
3 do you agree that that was -- these areas were covered in the  
4 two-day deposition?

5 MR. QUIGG: Well, yes and no, Your Honor. And, you  
6 know, I think it's important, maybe even before we get to  
7 Areas A through N, to talk a little bit about where we stand  
8 more generally.

9 THE COURT: Okay.

10 MR. QUIGG: And why. To answer your question though,  
11 certainly there were questions on each of these areas. But as  
12 I'll explain in a moment, we fundamentally disagree that a  
13 question in an area opens the door to any conceivable question  
14 on that topic. That's not the law --

15 THE COURT: Not necessarily any conceivable question.  
16 But let's take the first one.

17 A, Michigan's emergency manager law and Snyder's use  
18 of that law. Now, I'd be willing to limit that to the use of  
19 that law in Flint, Michigan.

20 MR. QUIGG: Your Honor, let me step back.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MR. OUIGG: And just be as direct as possible.

23 THE COURT: Please.

24 MR. QUIGG: We understand the Court's ruling on  
25 Monday. And we respect the Court's order. Nonetheless,

March 25, 2022

9

1      I think even -- even under the Court's opinion and order from  
2      Monday, our position remains valid.

3              The only path forward here is to play the deposition  
4      tape. Even as to the exact same questions that were asked at  
5      the deposition, Governor Snyder will invoke the Fifth  
6      Amendment if called as a witness.

7              THE COURT: Well --

8              MR. QUIGG: I'm happy to explain why we're -- why  
9      that's our position, but --

10             THE COURT: So he will invoke the Fifth Amendment  
11      you're saying as to questions -- perhaps even the exact same  
12      question.

13             Now, VNA and LAN have told me that they don't think  
14      they should be limited to precisely the same wording, because  
15      we're at a trial. We're trying to present a -- well, I'm not,  
16      but they are -- presenting a story to the jury and every  
17      question isn't going to be needed. You might just phrase it a  
18      little differently, a little more conversationally or  
19      something like that.

20             But so even as to those questions that are more or  
21      less identical, you're suggesting your client would plead the  
22      Fifth?

23             MR. QUIGG: Yes, Your Honor. I would go even beyond  
24      saying I'm suggesting that. I'm telling you that.

25             THE COURT: Okay. But you telling me that is

March 25, 2022

10

1       problematic in that I've made a ruling that as to those  
2       questions, he has waived the Fifth, and he may not exercise  
3       the Fifth. So just a minute.

4                   I think, Mr. Quigg, his alternative is to go to the  
5       Court of Appeals, because I'm not going to allow him to come  
6       in here and take the Fifth, because I've made a decision that  
7       it doesn't apply. He has waived his right to do that. He  
8       gave it up.

9                   MR. QUIGG: Two responses, Your Honor.

10                  THE COURT: Okay.

11                  MR. QUIGG: Response number 1 is I would be pleased  
12       to explain why we think notwithstanding the Court's ruling on  
13       Monday, the governor -- because the -- any waiver must be  
14       narrowly construed as the Court noted.

15                  THE COURT: Yes.

16                  MR. QUIGG: That he may nonetheless invoke the Fifth  
17       as to the exact same questions. But response number 2, more  
18       generally, if we -- if we collectively can't come to a  
19       resolution that involves playing the deposition video, which  
20       is, I think, for legally the right answer, also practically  
21       the right answer, then I agree with you that an appeal makes  
22       sense.

23                  But as Your Honor likely knows, the Court's order on  
24       Monday, any order coming out of this hearing is not appealable  
25       as matter of right. It's an interlocutory order, and it's not

March 25, 2022

11

1       a collateral order. So we're left with essentially three  
2       options to get this before the Court of Appeals.

3           The last option, the least preferable option I think  
4       for everyone is to defy the Court's order. The Second Circuit  
5       called this a semi-barbaric option. I think it's right. But  
6       defy the Court's order. Be held in contempt. And then we  
7       have an undoubted right to appeal.

8           The more sensible approach, we submit, would be for  
9       the Court to certify the opinion in order from Monday and any  
10       order coming out of the hearing today for interlocutory appeal  
11       under 1292(b). I'd be happy to walk through that.

12           THE COURT: I'm aware of 1292(b). And I hadn't been  
13       thinking about discussing it today. But that may be the  
14       sensible approach. Because I don't want what you're -- I  
15       didn't know it was called the barbaric option, but it's just  
16       not a good option.

17           MR. QUIGG: Agreed.

18           THE COURT: Let's just look at it that way.

19           No one wants -- I don't have any -- I've managed to  
20       go through this -- be in this job for eight years. I haven't  
21       held anyone in contempt. And I don't need -- I don't want to  
22       start now.

23           I have a gavel upstairs, and it's this big, and I've  
24       never had to use it, and I don't plan to use it. So that's  
25       just not really a good option.

March 25, 2022

12

1                   So what you -- but let me tell you, at least what I  
2 have set forth in the opinion, which I think the law  
3 absolutely supports in the Sixth Circuit in the Supreme Court  
4 is that your client cannot take a blanket Fifth.

5                   And you're saying your client still believes they  
6 have the -- or he has the right to take a blanket Fifth to any  
7 questions asked, even those asked that were already asked in  
8 the first deposition.

9                   MR. QUIGG: Well, look, Your Honor, if VNA and LAN  
10 wanted to question Governor Snyder about the make and model of  
11 his car, where he gets his hair cut, they're entitled to do  
12 that.

13                   But I take them at their word. They want to ask him  
14 questions that have complete overlap with his criminal  
15 charges. And in that circumstance --

16                   THE COURT: Yeah, exactly.

17                   MR. QUIGG: Yes.

18                   THE COURT: And they asked him those questions before  
19 and he -- you know, for the reason -- we're not going to  
20 rehash why I think he waived his right against  
21 self-incrimination as to those questions.

22                   But they asked him these questions before that they  
23 identified. I didn't find it that much of a joke or whatever  
24 you called it, what they -- what VNA and LAN put in.

25                   I thought they had citations to the record and so on,

March 25, 2022

13

1       so you could look at those questions and understand what they  
2       were.

3           I do understand that there's overlap with the  
4       questions that they want to ask. And potential evidence  
5       related to the criminal indictment. That has -- that's been  
6       very clear to me. It's the waiver of the right is what we're  
7       trying to discuss and what the scope of the waiver is.

8           So I think what we should do is if you're suggesting  
9       as to everything -- cause they don't identify the make and  
10       model of his car. So we know that's not a question. And I  
11       think what would be helpful is if you file your motion for  
12       interlocutory appeal.

13           MR. QUIGG: A motion in this Court?

14           THE COURT: Yeah.

15           MR. QUIGG: Explaining why we believe that the  
16       Court's order should be certified under 1292(b) ?

17           THE COURT: Yeah.

18           MR. QUIGG: Certainly. Happy to do that.

19           THE COURT: And I'm just trying to figure out whether  
20       there's a reason not to just make an oral motion. Although, I  
21       guess I'd like a chance to see what your thoughts are on it.

22           MR. QUIGG: Sure. I'm happy to address it orally,  
23       Your Honor. But we're also more than happy to submit  
24       something in writing.

25           THE COURT: Okay. Well, let me give it a minute's

March 25, 2022

14

1       thought. So then what -- what is your experience these days  
2 with how fast the Court of Appeals would address that issue?

3            MR. QUIGG: Well, this kind of issue doesn't arise  
4 every day. I would hope that if we filed a motion to expedite  
5 in the Court of Appeals -- well, I guess, number one, I would  
6 hope that the Court would take a petition.

7            THE COURT: Yeah.

8            MR. QUIGG: And then if we filed a motion to expedite  
9 and explain the circumstances that the Court would act  
10 promptly. But there are no guarantees, of course.

11           THE COURT: Hold on. Let me understand the 1292(b)  
12 process. I think I've only handled it either once -- maybe  
13 once. And the process is you make the motion to the district  
14 court first or you can also -- you can sidestep the district  
15 court and go -- no. Okay. That's what I thought.

16           So it comes to me first.

17           MR. QUIGG: And actually, Your Honor, as I mention,  
18 we're happy to file a motion. But you are enabled under  
19 1292(b) to certify order sua sponte.

20           THE COURT: Okay.

21           MR. QUIGG: So you needn't await our motion.

22           THE COURT: Well, I'd like to get your motion.

23           MR. QUIGG: Sure.

24           THE COURT: Because I'd like to understand your  
25 reasons and then be able to work my way through it in a

March 25, 2022

15

1 logical manner.

2 MR. QUIGG: Sure.

3 THE COURT: So then let's say that I grant that  
4 motion. The Court of Appeals still has to accept it as an  
5 interlocutory --

6 MR. QUIGG: Yes.

7 THE COURT: -- they don't automatically -- it's not  
8 an appeal as of right.

9 MR. QUIGG: It's not automatic. Although, I will  
10 note for the Court that there's precedent in the Sixth Circuit  
11 for using the 1292(b) procedure to address questions like  
12 this. Morganroth came before the Court of Appeals under  
13 1292(b).

14 THE COURT: Yeah. I saw that. Okay. Okay. As long  
15 as the decision involves a controlling question of law as to  
16 which there is substantial ground for difference of opinion,  
17 an immediate appeal from the order may materially advance the  
18 ultimate termination of the litigation.

19 I think the EPA lawyers, if they're listening, that's  
20 going to be familiar to them. I've had this pending. We've  
21 had some other things going on in this case. I plan to turn  
22 to that in the event that they're listening very soon. Okay.

23 So there's nothing further -- no further argument  
24 that you want to make on any of the areas identified by either  
25 VNA or LAN?

March 25, 2022

16

1           Your client, you're telling me, would go the barbaric  
2 route and take the Fifth in violation of the district court's  
3 order and suffer the consequences?

4           MR. QUIGG: Yes, Your Honor. If it came to that.

5           Because that's our only means to appeal.

6           THE COURT: Right.

7           MR. QUIGG: If the Court didn't certify the order,  
8 that's our only appeal.

9           THE COURT: Yeah. I would anticipate certifying the  
10 order just so that -- I try not to like hold -- you know, try  
11 to be secretive in the way I operate.

12           So sitting here right now, I don't see a reason that  
13 I wouldn't. I think there is an interesting question of law.  
14 I think the -- we would all be well served to have further  
15 guidance from the Court of Appeals.

16           So maybe what I should do is hear from Mr. Earley,  
17 Mr. Croft, Mr. Ambrose. I don't see Mr. Levine. Is someone  
18 here?

19           Oh, you're here. Excuse me, what is your name?

20           MS. MONTAGUE: My name is Sarissa Montague. I'm here  
21 with Levine & Levine on behalf of Mr. Baird.

22           THE COURT: Well, why don't we just start with  
23 Mr. Earley's lawyer.

24           There you are. You're right there. So, Mr. Mateo.

25           MR. JUAN MATEO: Good morning, Your Honor.

March 25, 2022

17

1                   THE COURT: Good morning.

2                   MR. JUAN MATEO: I echo Mr. Quigg's remarks. And I  
3 think you'll hear the same thing from everybody else in the  
4 same position in this case. And I have nothing but respect  
5 for the Court.

6                   THE COURT: Thank you.

7                   MR. JUAN MATEO: I have nothing but respect for the  
8 way you've managed this case and the way you've managed  
9 anything I've ever been in front of you --

10                  THE COURT: Well, thank you.

11                  MR. JUAN MATEO: -- before.

12                  But we are in a situation where as Mr. Earley's  
13 counsel, I have no choice but to take the direction that I'm  
14 taking, which is to direct him not to testify. And I agree  
15 with Mr. Quigg's remarks about the proposal by LAN and VNA.

16                  They want to basically have him come before this jury  
17 and ask questions that are absolutely central to the three  
18 charges he is facing in this indictment.

19                  And I just don't see any practical way where we could  
20 do that on a question-by-question basis and not violate your  
21 order and not put ourselves in a position where you might do  
22 what you've never done before. And I certainly have never  
23 been held in contempt, and I don't want to start now.

24                  THE COURT: No.

25                  MR. JUAN MATEO: And I just think that this process

March 25, 2022

18

1        of seeking -- asking you to certify the question and having us  
2 take the matter to the Sixth Circuit really is the only legal  
3 viable option that we have that makes sense.

4            I'm prepared to argue to you why, you know, in my  
5 view and those other lawyers who represent Mr. Earley in this  
6 case, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Evelyn, Mr. Santino Mateo who's in the  
7 courtroom today, feel that we just can't expose him to this  
8 kind of examination.

9            Part of the problem that we've had throughout this  
10 litigation is it doesn't matter what Mr. Earley has said or  
11 written. Whenever he has said something or written something,  
12 even though we believe it's accurate and we believe it can be  
13 corroborated independently as accurate, the two teams of  
14 prosecutors in this case have taken those writings and  
15 statements and twisted them.

16            And I'm going to -- you know, for example,  
17 Mr. Earley's charged in two counts with disseminating what  
18 this claim to be misleading information about two press  
19 releases that involve the TTHM public notice.

20            And for refusing to return back to the Detroit Water  
21 and Sewerage Department connection when it is absolutely clear  
22 that Mr. Earley has -- whatever releases were released done  
23 with the understanding that they were truthful.

24            And he's not the only one -- or the press releases  
25 weren't the only comments made to the public the water was

March 25, 2022

19

1       safe. We're talking about press releases issued January 2 and  
2       January 9 of 2015. We --

3                   THE COURT: Yeah. I appreciate what you're saying.

4       But I have no influence or involvement with that decision to  
5       indict your client.

6                   MR. JUAN MATEO: But the point is no matter what he  
7       says about what his role was when it came to his understanding  
8       of the water, the quality, his communications with either the  
9       LAN engineers or the department of environmental quality, you  
10      know, his testimony is pretty clear.

11                  He was never led to believe that the water was not  
12      safe. He didn't do anything that he thought was inappropriate  
13      or against the public health of the City of Flint. Yet when  
14      he says these things, they're distorting the comments, they're  
15      distorting the writings, and they're making criminal law  
16      accusations against him.

17                  So when I saw the LAN proposal where they want to  
18      rehash everything that he has testified to as well as going  
19      beyond that as to these criminal charges, pending cases,  
20      testimony that's been elicited, and these multiple criminal  
21      proceedings, he's put in an impossible situation.

22                  You know, we have to direct him under the Sixth  
23      Amendment to remain silent. So I think if you certify the  
24      question, that's the way out of this. You know. That's my  
25      position.

1 THE COURT: Okay.

2 MR. JUAN MATEO: I can go into more detail about  
3 particular exhibits and these problems that all implicate what  
4 he's being charged with.

11 MR. JUAN MATEO: That's correct, Your Honor.

15 MR. JUAN MATEO: That's correct, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Croft's lawyer. There you  
17 are.

18 Mr. Rusek, welcome. Are you going to say exactly the  
19 same thing?

20 MR. RUSEK: I hope not, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Oh, okay.

22 MR. RUSEK: I'm going to do my absolute best.

23 THE COURT: Okay.

24 MR. RUSEK: We are in the same position as

25 Governor Snyder as well as Mr. Earley. And I think that

March 25, 2022

21

1       Mr. Ambrose and Mr. Baird will have similar positions, as  
2 well, where especially after now seeing the VNA and LAN  
3 proposals as the questionings that our beliefs have just been  
4 reaffirmed.

5                   THE COURT: Okay.

6                   MR. RUSEK: Is that what the goal of the defendants  
7 is to have our clients sit on the stand and take the Fifth  
8 Amendment as much as possible. And their questions when we  
9 examine --

10                  THE COURT: Well, here's the difference between last  
11 Tuesday, whenever it was, that we met. The difference is that  
12 I am at this point in our hearing only prepared to order your  
13 clients to answer the questions in the areas already covered  
14 in the deposition.

15                  In the areas such in Part 2 of VNA and Parts 2 and 3,  
16 I'm prepared to have a hearing and have you explain to me why  
17 that would further incriminate your client.

18                  And if it does, then I am directed by the law and the  
19 constitution and the Supreme Court to err on the side of  
20 granting your client's wish to plead the Fifth with respect to  
21 areas that were not covered.

22                  MR. RUSEK: That's correct, Your Honor. There is  
23 that further risk of incrimination. In each of the areas that  
24 were identified. I'll focus on VNA, because that was the more  
25 detailed of the two proposals.

March 25, 2022

22

1                   As a little bit of background, Mr. Croft is charged  
2 with two counts of willful neglect of duty. The first is  
3 essentially he is alleged to have willfully neglected to  
4 convey the risk of health effects --

5                   THE COURT: Well, so, okay. But are you saying that  
6 your client will answer -- let me go to your client's  
7 material. There it is -- will answer 1A through Q?

8                   MR. RUSEK: No, Your Honor. He would assert the  
9 Fifth Amendment.

10                  THE COURT: Oh, then we are right where we are.

11                  MR. RUSEK: I believe that we are.

12                  THE COURT: Okay.

13                  MR. RUSEK: But there's a little bit of nuance. And  
14 I have maybe a suggestion for the Court to consider, as well.

15                  THE COURT: Okay.

16                  MR. RUSEK: So just to take this step back to set the  
17 scene. The willful neglect of duty charges are, one, based on  
18 a neglect of conveying the risk of health effects of the Flint  
19 water system.

20                  And then the second count is essentially based on a  
21 willful neglect to convey the risk of corrosion concerns  
22 within the Flint water system.

23                  There's three elements of a willful neglect of duty  
24 charge. One, prosecutor's have to proof that the person is a  
25 public official or holding public trust employment. That, of

March 25, 2022

23

1 course, has a number of caveats associated with it. The  
2 second is that the defendant had a duty enjoined by law. And  
3 the third is that the defendant willfully neglected to perform  
4 that duty.

5 So when we start looking at some of the areas where  
6 the VNA defendants have proposed additional testimony from  
7 Mr. Croft, and we'll just start with 1A.

8 And that seems like something very simple. Croft's  
9 educational and employment background. But that's going to  
10 directly implicate Elements 1 and 3.

11 Under Sub B, the VNA defendants want to ask questions  
12 about Croft's employment with the City of Flint including his  
13 roles and responsibilities --

14 THE COURT: This part I know. This part I knew when  
15 I made the decision on Monday. But the decision was based on  
16 the fact that your client was facing indictment at the time  
17 that he elected to waive the Fifth Amendment.

18 He had come to the Court, asked for protection, said,  
19 "I know I'm at criminal -- risk of criminal indictment."

20 And I said, "You may very well be at risk. You can  
21 take the Fifth. But you're going to have to do it on a  
22 question-by-question basis." And he chose to answer.

23 So those are the questions that he's waived as far --  
24 so I don't need to go through all these questions. I looked  
25 at them. They are indeed -- I didn't check every citation. I

March 25, 2022

24

1       just did a little random citation -- cite check.

2           But it's really Part 2 that I'm interested in. But  
3       if you're telling me he'll waive -- for all those reasons that  
4       you think he should not have testified at his deposition or  
5       something, that won't be helpful to our process.

6           What's helpful is if he's going to answer any of  
7       these questions, that's one thing. And if he's not, then  
8       we're right with we were for Mr. Snyder and --

9           MR. RUSEK: Yes, Your Honor. I would anticipate  
10       instructing him not to answer on the Fifth Amendment for the  
11       reasons that -- some of the reasons that the Court hd outlined  
12       in its -- Monday's opinion.

13           And we look at some of the cases in the Sixth  
14       Circuit. And as of now as a nonparty witness, Mr. Croft does  
15       have that right to be free from further incrimination, even if  
16       the Court has determined that he waived his Fifth Amendment  
17       rights to some degree.

18           So even the verbatim repetition of earlier answers  
19       has the ability to further incriminate him. And that's really  
20       exemplified when you look at the elements of the offense in  
21       the areas of inquiring.

22           In the Morganroth case, you know, the additional  
23       answers could be an independent source of evidence. Miranti  
24       discussed how an additional under oath statement can add  
25       credibility to a prior statement.

March 25, 2022

25

1                   THE COURT: No, I hear you. I mean, these are the  
2 arguments you made. At least you implied these arguments, and  
3 I'm not unaware of them. It's not -- it wasn't without  
4 consciousness that these are the arguments.

5                   Your clients are now indicted. At the moment, at the  
6 very moment of their deposition, they did not know -- they  
7 either weren't indicted or didn't know they were, because it  
8 was sealed.

9                   But I considered all of that, looked at the  
10 indictments, considered it all and determined that it was a  
11 single proceeding and they had waived their right.

12                  So it sounds like what you're suggesting is an  
13 interlocutory appeal is the route that your client would  
14 prefer to go than to be found in contempt.

15                  MR. RUSEK: Certainly over contempt, Your Honor. But  
16 there may be a better route.

17                  THE COURT: Okay. What is that?

18                  MR. RUSEK: A more expeditious route. So with all  
19 these arguments that I've kind of laid out this morning, those  
20 are going to come up on pretty much every question that could  
21 be posed. That's not a verbatim recitation of a question from  
22 the deposition. So that looks and creates just a procedural  
23 nightmare for the Court in front of the jury.

24                  The Court can easily declare these witnesses as  
25 unavailable under 804 --

March 25, 2022

26

1                   THE COURT: We've been down that road. We've been  
2 down that road.

3                   MR. RUSEK: It would be much quicker, Your Honor, and  
4 expeditious. And you wouldn't have the jury being influenced  
5 by this constant back and forth talk of the Fifth.

6                   THE COURT: No, no. Mr. Rusek, I absolutely know  
7 that route. And that's where we sort of started with this  
8 whole thing until I was able to take some time to really dig  
9 into this area of law. And it could come to that.

10                  I mean, if what happens is you file a timely motion  
11 for interlocutory appeal, if I am able to make a decision  
12 quickly -- I mean, it takes time. We have a trial. I have  
13 250 other cases.

14                  But assuming I can turn to it and do it in a timely  
15 manner, if it's time to call one of your witnesses and the  
16 Court of Appeals hasn't made a decision, then I may very well  
17 determine they're unavailable at that point because -- but  
18 that's down the road so.

19                  MR. RUSEK: Thank you, Your Honor. And with those  
20 other options out there, I do think that at this point then  
21 that we are requesting that the Court certify the question  
22 under 1292(b) so that we can pursue that -- pursue the  
23 interlocutory appeal at this time.

24                  THE COURT: Okay. And I think as I understand  
25 1292(b), because I was just looking at the language of it, I

March 25, 2022

27

1      have to -- the district court shall so state in writing in  
2      such order. So I have to do a written order. So there is no  
3      shortcut that I can take.

4           So if I'm not taking a shortcut, it would be very  
5      helpful to me to have your motions in writing to make sure I'm  
6      not missing some of your arguments.

7           MR. RUSEK: Absolutely, Your Honor. We can -- we're  
8      prepared to do that.

9           THE COURT: Okay. What -- how much time do you need  
10     to file your motion?

11           MR. RUSEK: I would like to confer with fellow  
12     counsel, Your Honor. I think that we can get it done  
13     relatively quickly, though, especially with trial going on  
14     right now.

15           THE COURT: Yeah. It would need to be done really  
16     quickly. But let's hear -- we need to hear from Mr. Ambrose.

17           MR. RATAJ: I'm ready, Your Honor.

18           THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Rataj.

19           MR. RATAJ: Good morning, your Honor.

20           THE COURT: Good morning.

21           MR. RATAJ: Your Honor, let me preface my -- and I'll  
22     be very brief, because we don't need to continue to rehash  
23     this whole thing.

24           THE COURT: No.

25           MR. RATAJ: But I just want to make a couple of

March 25, 2022

28

1 comments. As you know, I've had the privilege of trying a  
2 case in front of Your Honor when you were a relatively new  
3 judge.

4 THE COURT: Very new.

5 MR. RATAJ: And I have a great deal of respect for  
6 Your Honor. I have a great deal of respect for the Court  
7 obviously. But we have to respectfully disagree with Your  
8 Honor's decision.

9 THE COURT: Oh, certainly.

10 MR. RATAJ: And this is not a single proceeding.

11 THE COURT: You don't even have to do it  
12 respectfully. You can just disagree.

13 MR. RATAJ: But I'm trying to be -- I have to be  
14 respectful, Judge.

15 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

16 MR. RATAJ: So to reiterate, this is not a single  
17 proceeding. We did not waive. And so, again, we respectfully  
18 disagree with Your Honor's order.

19 But, you know, I have to say this for the record,  
20 Judge. When I received -- and I looked at all of the  
21 submissions by the fine lawyers over here representing the  
22 engineering firms yesterday including the one that was  
23 directed at Mr. Ambrose.

24 And the way I view it is they basically want our  
25 clients to get up on the witness stand and just testify. And

March 25, 2022

29

1       that they're going to be able to cross-examine our clients  
2       with impunity, and that is just not going to happen, Judge. I  
3       think that's clear.

4                   THE COURT: Okay.

5                   MR. RATAJ: So, you know, I will advise the Court  
6       that my client, Mr. Ambrose, will assert his Fifth Amendment  
7       right against self-incrimination to any question that is  
8       propounded to him.

9                   And so for that reason, I will join with my  
10       colleagues, and we would respectfully request that the Court  
11       certify this for appeal.

12                  I think we're all in agreement the Sixth Circuit has  
13       not addressed this issue. This is a perfect case for the  
14       Sixth Circuit to take a look at this issue and provide  
15       direction going forward on this issue.

16                  So those are my comments, Judge.

17                  THE COURT: All right. Thank you, very much.

18                  And Ms. Montague for Mr. Baird.

19                  MS. MONTAGUE: Thank you, Your Honor.

20                  THE COURT: You're welcome.

21                  MS. MONTAGUE: As the one going last, I'm not going  
22       to repeat everything else that everyone else has said. We,  
23       too, though, I will say, do respect the Court. We respect the  
24       Court's decision. But we, too, will be advising Mr. Baird not  
25       to testify.

March 25, 2022

30

1           And it is our expectation that he will follow our  
2 advice. It's not the route that we want to go. We also would  
3 like the Sixth Circuit to look at this to make a decision and  
4 then we can proceed from there.

5           THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, very much.

6           MS. MONTAGUE: Thank you.

7           THE COURT: Well, okay. So is it Mr. Stein, are you  
8 arguing for VNA?

9           MR. STEIN: Yes, Your Honor.

10           THE COURT: My thought here is that -- I mean, we --  
11 there's sort of been an oral argument for an interlocutory  
12 appeal. I'm trying to figure out whether we would even have  
13 an argument when the written motion -- Mr. Kent says, "Don't  
14 do it." He's always making facial gestures and everything.

15           MR. STEIN: Your Honor, I think I can address our  
16 position in a way that would be helpful.

17           THE COURT: Okay. Please do.

18           MR. STEIN: Which is we've heard different things  
19 from different people about what they think we're really up  
20 to.

21           THE COURT: Yeah.

22           MR. STEIN: I want to be very clear. Our interest  
23 and our goal is to get these witnesses on the witness stand so  
24 that we can ask them relevant questions and put their evidence  
25 in front of this jury. That's our goal. Plain and simple.

March 25, 2022

31

1                   And we will do everything in our power to make that  
2 happen. And if that means helping to expedite an appeal, we  
3 will do that. Because that's what we want, is to get them on  
4 the stand so that the jury and the public can hear their  
5 testimony.

6                   THE COURT: Yeah. Thank you. Yeah. It's worth  
7 repeating. I don't have any goal other than continuing with  
8 the trial, as well.

9                   So is it -- who -- oh, Mr. Mason.

10                  MR. MASON: I'd be remiss if I didn't say a few words  
11 based on what I heard, Your Honor.

12                  THE COURT: Don't remiss then. I'm just saying just  
13 go ahead. We spent a lot of time --

14                  MR. MASON: These folks had the opportunity before  
15 the depositions. There was full knowledge and advice of  
16 counsel --

17                  THE COURT: See, now you're arguing the motion. And  
18 we're not going to get anywhere with that. But go ahead.

19                  MR. MASON: The certification -- the certification is  
20 fine to bring it up. It is -- but to force this Court into  
21 this position when they waived it, it's a Hail Mary now in  
22 terms of them wanting to go to the Sixth Circuit when they on  
23 advice of counsel testified.

24                  And to suggest as Mr. Earley's counsel did that  
25 there's nonsense and us distorting things is absolutely false.

March 25, 2022

32

1       And the reality is they put the Court in a bad situation.

2           One thing Your Honor mentioned that I think we need  
3           to be careful about, and that is despite the plaintiffs'  
4           suggesting yesterday they didn't have a position on this.

5           We do not want to be in a situation where all of a  
6           sudden while the certification is up with -- the motion is up  
7           with the Sixth Circuit that all of a sudden, plaintiffs start  
8           calling all of these witnesses to force the issue and force  
9           Your Honor to say, "Well, we're going to play a videotape."

10           That would be totally unfair.

11           There is time in this case to allow this process to  
12           work. And I respectfully ask the Court to consider that, that  
13           there not be gamesmanship with respect to forcing that issue  
14           if Your Honor is going to go forward as you've indicated to  
15           certify the issue.

16           THE COURT: I appreciate what you're saying,  
17           Mr. Mason. I will have no control over the Court of Appeals.

18           MR. MASON: I agree.

19           THE COURT: It just doesn't work that way.

20           But what I want to do is get a very tight briefing  
21           schedule and maybe take Mr. Kent up on his suggestion that we  
22           don't take time for oral argument on it. We just do it.

23           And the one time I certified a case for interlocutory  
24           appeal. We didn't have an argument on that either so.

25           So, Mr. Quigg, how much time do you need to file your

March 25, 2022

33

1 motion? Do you have it written?

2 Thank you for coming to the microphone.

3 MR. QUIGG: Certainly, Your Honor. We don't have  
4 something written. But -- I'll take my mask off.

5 We don't have something written. But as I adverted  
6 to earlier, I was prepared to address 1292(b) today. So I  
7 expect we could get something in writing quite quickly.

8 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to open the calendar.

9 MR. QUIGG: So -- and I have a suggestion perhaps to  
10 expedite the schedule, as well.

11 But in terms of getting something to you, we'll -- I  
12 think it's in the Court's interest for the witnesses to  
13 coordinate and perhaps submit a single motion with joinders  
14 from other parties, and that will take a bit of coordination  
15 perhaps.

16 But I would anticipate we could have something to the  
17 Court by Monday or Tuesday of next week.

18 THE COURT: That would be great. Why don't we say  
19 Tuesday close of electronic business, which is 11:59 P.M.

20 MR. QUIGG: Sure. Yep.

21 THE COURT: And then Mr. Stein, how much time do you  
22 need to respond?

23 MR. STEIN: I don't think we'll need much time to  
24 respond. I would say the next day.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Kent says the next day

March 25, 2022

34

1       Wednesday close of electronic business.

2            MR. KENT: Agreed.

3            THE COURT: Okay.

4            MR. STERN: I imagine we may weigh in, too.

5            THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to get there,

6        Mr. Stern. Would you -- is Wednesday close of electronic

7        business okay?

8            MR. STERN: No problem.

9            THE COURT: Okay. And then I'll just turn to it  
10      right away. And see what -- how fast I can -- I know it will  
11      be faster than the EPA's motion in our case.

12           MR. QUIGG: Thank you, Your Honor. And if I may,  
13      just one comment on the 1292(b) procedure, too --

14           THE COURT: Sure.

15           MR. QUIGG: -- to make sure we are able to expedite  
16      this as quickly as possible.

17           As the Court noted, the Court must issue a written  
18      order. And there is case law in the Sixth Circuit and other  
19      Court of Appeals have --

20           THE COURT: Just a second. Sorry.

21           MR. MAIMON: Is it the Sixth Circuit?

22           MR. QUIGG: Monitoring the webinar?

23           THE COURT: No, no. This is my friend.

24           MR. QUIGG: There is appellate case law, Your Honor,  
25      making clear that a simple recitation of the elements in

March 25, 2022

35

1       1292(b) is not sufficient for a certification order.

2           THE COURT: So my order I can't just say it meets  
3 this --

4           MR. QUIGG: Correct.

5           THE COURT: Be gone.

6           MR. QUIGG: Correct.

7           THE COURT: I'll be careful. I appreciate all the  
8 help I can get. Do you want to submit a proposed order?  
9 Don't do it. Don't do it. Okay.

10          MR. STERN: Your Honor, may I just say one thing?

11          THE COURT: Sure. Just come to a microphone.

12          MR. STERN: Sure. I just want to note for the record  
13 that the plaintiffs have absolutely no intention to utilize  
14 this with gamesmanship. We are as best we can bringing  
15 witnesses as quickly as we can.

16           This issue goes well beyond this trial and these  
17 plaintiffs. That said, we'll call witnesses when we're trying  
18 to put on our case in the order that we think is best for our  
19 clients, because they have rights, as well.

20           But I can assure the Court there's no gamesmanship.  
21 There's no collaboration. There's -- I don't even know what  
22 their motion is going to say, Your Honor.

23           And so this was a very dignified, calm proceeding.  
24 And then somehow us who haven't said anything, this somehow  
25 turns on our gamesmanship tactics, and there's no tactics

March 25, 2022

36

1 here.

2 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. STERN: Sure.

4 THE COURT: All right. Well, thank you, all, for  
5 being here. Is there anything further at this time?

6 MR. MAIMON: If I can --

7 THE COURT: Oh, Mr. Maimon.

8 MR. MAIMON: I had all my notes ready to discuss the  
9 protocols of the so-called roadmap.

10 THE COURT: Yeah.

11 MR. MAIMON: I do believe that it's problematic. But  
12 I think that we're ten steps before then at this point.

13 THE COURT: I think so.

14 MR. MAIMON: Because either, A, the circuit will take  
15 it -- either, A, Your Honor will certify. B, the circuit will  
16 take it. And then after that, we may be in a position where  
17 we're dealing with the types of protocols that we're going to  
18 be in.

19 THE COURT: Right.

20 MR. MAIMON: And I just don't want the silence today  
21 to --

22 THE COURT: You're not waiving anything.

23 MR. MAIMON: Thank you. Thank you.

24 THE COURT: No one's waived anything.

25 All right. Well thank you, all. Have -- get some

March 25, 2022

37

1 rest or a little bit over the weekend. I know there's some  
2 briefing. And I'll start doing some reading on it, as well.

(Proceedings Concluded)

4 || — — — — —

5

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

7 I, Jeseca C. Eddington, Federal Official Court  
8 Reporter, do hereby certify the foregoing 37 pages are a true  
9 and correct transcript of the above entitled proceedings.

10 /s/ JESECA C. EDDINGTON 03/25/2022  
Jeseca C. Eddington, RDR, RMR, CRR, FCRR Date

03/25/2022  
Date

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

30

01

2